

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA



Sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties  
Bangkok (Thailand), 3-14 March 2013

Summary record of the fourth session of Committee II

6 March 2010: 11h40 - 12h30

Chair: R. Gabel (United States of America)  
Secretariat: J. Barzdo  
J.C. Vasquez  
M. Yeater  
Rapporteurs: J. Gray  
C. Rutherford

**Strategic matters**

19. CITES and livelihoods

Peru, the Chair of the Working Group on CITES and Livelihoods, introduced document CoP16 Doc.19 (Rev.1) and its annexes, containing a draft resolution and draft decisions. Jamaica, South Africa and Zimbabwe supported these. Japan was generally supportive, but proposed changing "Parties should" to Parties are encouraged to in the second draft decision directed to the Parties in Annex 2. India supported this.

Brazil supported the draft resolution in principle, but proposed changes to the text as follows:

Sub-paragraphs ii), iv) and v) in paragraph a) after the second "AGREES that" to read:

- ii) *Maximizing the benefits for poor rural communities in the value chains concerned;*
- iv) *~~Developing~~ Promoting socially responsible trade associations with clear obligations for benefit sharing to distribute the benefits among its members;*
- v) *~~Recognizing resource tenure and cultural and intellectual property rights for indigenous, tribal and poor rural communities~~ Developing, with the full participation of the poor rural communities, mechanisms for protection of their traditional knowledge, innovations and practices...*

The paragraph after "Regarding enabling policies" beginning RECOMMENDS now to read:

*INVITES Parties to explore the use of registered marks of certification and origin for products obtained legally and sustainably by poor rural communities in accordance with CITES provisions;*

Paragraph a) under the second AGREES now to read in its entirety:

*Implementation of some CITES-listings may encourage ex situ production, which may lead to loss of profits. Market-based incentives may then be required to encourage the benefit of profits to these communities;*

Argentina supported the draft resolution and decisions and agreed to the amendments proposed by Brazil. It also proposed the following amendment to the last paragraph of the draft resolution as follows:

*RECOMMENDS ALSO that mitigation activities ~~not be based~~ take into account not only on CITES-listed species ~~only~~ but on the whole ecosystem that contains them.*

These changes were supported by Botswana and Colombia.

The Philippines requested the following insertions in the draft resolution: in the fifth preambular paragraph after "poor rural communities" insert specifically those who are traditionally dependent on the wildlife resources for livelihoods and directly affected by the implementation of CITES-listing decisions; in subparagraph c) i) under the second "AGREES" insert bridging finance mechanisms, after "Developing"; and in subparagraph a), under the second "RECOMMENDS", insert generating livelihoods through sustainable tourism, after "ecosystem services,".

Indonesia asked that "indigenous tribal" be deleted in subparagraph a) v) under the second "AGREES", as it believed its inclusion tautological.

Canada generally supported the document but wished the language of the draft resolution to be softened, to make clear that it was not binding on Parties. It also asked that the toolkit for the rapid assessment of impacts of CITES implementation on the livelihoods of poor rural communities, and guidelines to address such impacts, be provided on the CITES website as stand-alone documents.

Colombia believed the Working Group should continue its business until CoP17, as did India and Jamaica. The United States believed that the business of the Working Group on CITES and Livelihoods should now be concluded. It opposed both annexes of the document but supported the publication of the toolkit and would support a review of it.

Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, also voiced its approval of the draft resolution and decisions and added that it did not object to the changes proposed during the session. Mexico, however, objected to the use of the phrase "poor rural communities" in the text, on the grounds that the livelihoods of other communities also deserved consideration, and sympathized with concerns voiced by the United States and Canada that livelihoods fell outside the purview of CITES.

The Chair asking interested Parties to discuss formation of a small working group<sup>1</sup> to prepare revisions to the draft resolution, with a view to formal constitution of this group in the following session.

The meeting was adjourned at 12h30.

---

<sup>1</sup> Membership: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Ireland (on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia), Mexico, Peru (Chair), the Philippines, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States and Zimbabwe.